



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/537,001	03/28/2000	Venkat V. Easwar	LS/0001.02	4778

7590 06/09/2004
Judith A Szepesi
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

AGGARWAL, YOGESH K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/537,001

Applicant(s)

EASWAR ET AL.

Examiner

Yogesh K Aggarwal

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03/25/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 47-51 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Addition of new claims 52-56 is acknowledged.

Examiners Response:

4. Applicant's comments (Amendment, pp 14 top paragraph 1) regarding claims 14-16 of the present invention are noted. Applicant argues that Hoffman (US Patent # 5,761,655) does not teach or suggest separating the image into layers, where each layer comprise two-dimensional data. However the '655 patent has not been used for teaching the separation of image into layers but the suggestive teaching of transmitting the attribute information indicating basic features of the image as claimed.
5. Applicant's comments (Amendment, pp 14 bottom paragraph 3) regarding claims 25-27 of the present invention are noted. Applicant argues that Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224) discusses a high-performance file undelete and does not address image transfer at all and so belongs to non-analogous art. Deleting/undeleting files can be broadly classified as an image file transfer process. Furthermore claims 25-27 do not address the issues of image file transfer at all rather of file storage, so '224 patent would make obvious to one skilled in the art the limitations of file storage as claimed.
6. Applicant's comments (Amendment, pp 15 bottom and pp 16 top) regarding claims 36-46 and 47-51 of the present invention are noted. Applicant argues that Ferriere (US Patent #

Art Unit: 2615

5,880,856) is silent about rendering of the entire image with increased resolution or quality. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The '856 patent discloses (Col. 3 lines 20-49 figure 4) that each subband is decomposed from the subbands and transferred as row-blocks (layers) in the order of increasing levels of resolution and therefore increasing quality. These row-blocks correspond to different layers of the image and therefore '856 patent does teach rendering of the entire image with increased resolution or quality. . In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. partitioning the image information into subbands and then organizing the bands into layers corresponding to different bitplanes, Applicants' specification Page 47-48) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

7. Applicants' comments regarding claim 50 (Amendment, bottom page 16 and top page 17) are considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Pratt (US PG-PUB # 2001/0049693) discusses mapping binary objects in database management and does not address image transfer at all and so belongs to non-analogous art. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 50 does not address the issues of image file transfer at all rather of file storage, so '693 publication would make obvious to one skilled in the art the limitations of file storage raised in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. Claims 1 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

Art Unit: 2615

regards as the invention. The newly added limitation “each layer comprising two-dimensional data covering every pixel of the image” is not consistent with the Applicants’ specification. For example, Fig. 5B and page 48 lines 9-19 disclose the different resolutions and quality for each layer described in the grid 550. The base layer (i.e. layer 00) that has the lowest resolution (160x120) cannot cover every pixel of the image as claimed and similarly other layers cannot cover every pixel of the image because their resolution is less than the original layer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-13, 17-22, 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,067,383 to Taniguchi et al. in view of Taubman et al. (US Patent # 6,546,143).

[Claim 1]

Taniguchi discloses “A method for storing and transmitting image data between occasionally connected devices, the method comprising”:

capturing an image at a sensor of a first device (col. 11 lines 49-50 fig. 1), storing the image as image data in a memory of the first device (col. 12 lines 33-35 fig. 4), separating the image data into separate color planes, according to a particular color space (col. 11 lines 50-52 fig. 1), transforming each of the planes into separate bands, based on frequency information present in each plane (col. 11 lines 52-54 fig. 1), quantizing each band of each of the planes to a particular

Art Unit: 2615

bit depth (col. 11 lines 54-55 fig. 1), coding each band of each of the planes for compressing the image data (col. 11 lines 55-57),

Taniguchi fails to teach “based on quality and resolution provided by each band at a certain bit depth, organizing the bands into a plurality of layers suitable for progressive transmission to a target device and upon connection of the first device to a second device, transmitting a selected one of said plurality of layers from the first device to the second device”. However Taubman teaches that it is well known and used in the art to have based on quality and resolution provided by each band at a certain bit depth, organizing the bands into a plurality of layers suitable for progressive transmission to a target device and upon connection of the first device to a second device, transmitting a selected one of said plurality of layers from the first device to the second device (col. 1 lines 35-67, col. 2 lines 1-2)[The wavelet transform coefficients (frequency bands) can be transmitted in an “embedded bit-stream” is being read as organizing the bands(wavelet transform coefficients) into layers (embedded bit-stream). These “embedded bit-streams” (layers) are based upon a progressive transmission of quality or resolution as taught in Taubman reference (col. 1 lines 55-65)].

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi and Taubman it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to organize the wavelet bands (sub-bands) of Taniguchi into a plurality of layers (“embedded bit-stream”) as taught in Taubman for progressive transmission to a target device based upon the quality and resolution of the bands. The benefit of doing so would be so that the images can be transmitted based upon quality or resolution progressively and therefore utilizing the available bandwidth efficiently as taught in Taubman (col. 1 lines 55-65).

Art Unit: 2615

Claim 2 recites "... wherein said particular color space comprises YUV color space" reads on Taniguchi (col. 13 lines 30-32 fig. 4).

Claim 3 recites "... wherein said particular color space comprises RGB color space" reads on Taniguchi (col. 13 lines 28-30 fig. 4).

Claim 4 recites, "... wherein the image data stored in memory comprises mosaic image data" " reads on Taniguchi (col. 13 lines 28-30 fig. 4).

[RGB color space can be a stored in a Bayer pattern, which forms the mosaic data].

Claim 5 recites "... wherein said step of organizing the bands into a plurality of layers comprises: organizing the bands into a plurality of layers of a quality/resolution matrix" reads on Taubman (col. 1 lines 55-65).

Claim 6 recites "... wherein said step of organizing the bands into a plurality of layers comprises: "selecting one or more particular bands to comprise a given layer, each band being represented to a particular bit depth," reads on Taubman (col. 1 lines 60-67, col. 2 lines 1-2).

Claim 7 recites "... wherein each layer stores image data for rendering the image at a particular resolution and a particular quality" reads on Taubman (col. 1 lines 55-65).

Claim 8 recites "... wherein a first layer of said plurality of layers stores information pertaining a rendering the image at low resolution and low quality" reads on Taubman (col. 1 lines 40-49).

Claim 9 recites "... wherein said first layer comprises a subset selected from the smallest ones of the bands" reads on Taubman (col. 1 lines 40-49).

Claim 10 recites "... wherein said first layer stores each band of said subset only to a particular bit depth" reads on Taniguchi [When the bands are quantized as taught in Taniguchi

Art Unit: 2615

(col. 11 lines 54-55 fig. 1) they have a particular bit-depth so that each the first layer which contains a subset of the bands up to a particular bit-depth].

Claim 11 recites, "...Wherein each layer includes information from all color planes," [Because the image is separated into RGB or YUV color plane which are then wavelet transformed into different bands and bands are organized into layers so each layer (embedded bit-stream) can have bit-planes belonging to all the color spaces i.e. RGB or YUV].

Claim 12 recites, "...wherein the layers are interdependent [Because the layers (embedded bit-stream) in Taubman can be transmitted by truncating the bit-stream to get a low image quality so the layers are interdependent on each other i.e. one single layer is not enough to get a good image quality].

Claim 13 recites, "...wherein the layers are independent" [Because some layers are not transmitted without any degradation in image quality so they are independent of each other].

Claim 17 recites "...wherein said memory comprises a frame buffer for storing image data" reads on Taniguchi (col. 8 lines 27-30).

Claim 18 recites "...wherein said first and second devices are occasionally connected wirelessly" reads on Taniguchi (col. 1 lines 41-45).

[Various kinds of communication lines can be wirelessly connected devices]

Claim 19 recites "...wherein said first and second devices are occasionally connected over a wire line connection" reads on Taniguchi (col. 1 lines 41-45).

[Various kinds of communication lines can be devices connected over a wire line connection].

[Claim 20]

Art Unit: 2615

Taubman teaches a step of transmitting a selected one of said plurality of layers from the first device to the second device comprises initially transmitting a first layer of said plurality of layers; and upon reconnection of the two devices at a later point in time, transmitting subsequent layers of said plurality of layers". (col. 1 lines 40-49) [The user can truncate the bit-stream (layers) transfer at any point in time if the image turns out to be undesirable and also reconnect later].

[Claim 21]

Taubman teaches transmitting of layers between two devices but do not explicitly teach disconnecting the two devices; at a later point in time, re-establishing a connection between the two devices; transmitting an additional layer of said plurality of layers while the two devices are connected; and thereafter disconnecting the two devices. However it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that if the receiving computer can order an image of specific resolution for preview purposes as taught in Taubman (col. 1 lines 60-67, col. 2 lines 1-2) then the two devices can be disconnected and at a later point in time, re-establish a connection between the two devices to transmit an additional layer of said plurality of layers while the two devices are connected and thereafter disconnect the two devices again.

[Claim 22]

Taubman teaches that second device controls, which layers, are transmitted (col. 2 lines 1-2).

[Claims 28 and 29]

Taniguchi and Taubman fails to teach explicitly, "... wherein said first device stores information indicating which layers have been transmitted to the second device and said second device has access to said information indicating which layers have been transmitted to the second device".

Art Unit: 2615

However it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the user at the first device or the second device have access to the information about which layers are transmitted.

[Claim 30]

Taniguchi and Taubman fails to teach explicitly, "... transmitting at least some of the layers to a third device; and thereafter retransmitting the layers at said third device to said second device".

However it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the layers can be transmitted and retransmitted between any number of devices.

[Claim 31]

Taubman teaches, "rendering the image at the second device upon receipt of a first one of said plurality of layers"(col. 2 lines 1-2).

[Claim 32]

Taubman teaches, "updating the rendering of the image at the second device upon receipt of subsequent ones of said plurality of layers"[col. 1 lines 60-69 teach "Progressive-by-resolution" that involves rendering the image depending upon ordering the coefficients embedded in the bit-stream according to resolution of the image].

[Claim 33]

Taubman teaches wherein layers are selected for transmission to first increase quality of the image that may be rendered at the second device (col. 1 lines 55-59).

[Claim 34]

Taubman teaches wherein layers are selected for transmission to first increase resolution of the image that may be rendered at the second device (col. 1 lines 60-67, col. 2 lines 1-2).

[Claim 35]

Art Unit: 2615

The examiner notes that each layer selected for transmission is dependent on only particular layers that have been previously transmitted because all the layers previously transmitted and the layer, which is selected for transmission, are needed to render the resolution of the complete image.

11. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (US Patent No. 6,067,383) in view of Taubman et al. (US Patent # 6,546,143) as applied to claim 1 above in further view of Hoffman (US Patent # 5,761,655).

Re Claim 14, Taniguchi in view of Taubman fails to teach transmitting attribute information indicating basic features of the image as claimed. However these limitations are well known in the art and obvious as evidenced in Hoffman (col. 9 lines 15-20, col. 2 lines 55-57).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi, Taubman and Hoffman as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have been motivated at the time of the invention to incorporate transmitting attribute information indicating basic features of the image. Doing so would allow the files to be easily searched as suggested by Hoffman (col. 3 lines 2-5).

[Claim 15]

Hoffman teaches "... wherein said attribute information includes selected ones of width and height of the image, aperture and exposure time used to capture the image, analog gains of the sensor when the image was captured, and a timestamp for the image". (col. 2 lines 55-57).

[This invention solves this problem of recognizing the image w.r.t size, which can be the width and height, age, which is the timestamp of the image, and any other way, which is being claimed].

[Claim 16]

Art Unit: 2615

Hoffman teaches "... wherein said attribute information includes a thumbnail bitmap of the image". (col. 9 lines 15-2).

12. Claims 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,067,383 to Taniguchi et al. in view of Taubman et al. (US Patent # 6,546,143) and in further view of Ferriere (US Patent # 5,880,856).

[Claim 23]

Taniguchi in view of Taubman fail to teach "...wherein said step of organizing the bands into a plurality of layers includes: storing each layer as a record" as claimed. However these limitations are well known in the art and obvious as evidenced in Ferriere (col. 9 lines 45-48 figure 13).

[Each row block is like a record].

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi and Ferriere as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the said step of organizing the bands into a plurality of layers including storing each layer as a record. Doing so would provide his minimizes storage space and also minimizes the recurring processing costs, which would otherwise be necessary, to transform and arrange the image data prior to or during each transfer as suggested by Ferriere (Col. 9 lines 16-19 figure 13).

[Claim 24]

Ferriere teaches "... wherein each record is stored as a file in a file system of the first device (Col. 9 lines 19-22 figure 13).

13. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (US Patent No. 6,067,383), Taubman et al. (US Patent # 6,546,143), Ferriere et al (US Patent # 5,880,856) and in further view of Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224).

Art Unit: 2615

[Claim 25]

Taniguchi in view of Taubman and Ferriere fail to teach, "... storing a record directory for accessing a record for a particular layer". However these limitations are well known in the art and obvious as evidenced in Davis (col. 6 lines 32-35 fig. 6).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi, Taniguchi, Ferriere and Davis as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have storing a record directory for accessing a record for a particular layer. Doing so would provide a method for deleting files on a UNIX file system, so that they may subsequently be undeleted, without any possibility of loss or damage (in the abstract).

[Claim 26]

The method of claim 25, wherein said record directory includes a directory entry storing a filename for each record (Davis col.6 lines 38-40)

[Claim 27]

The method of claim 26, Ferriere and Davis fails to teach that "... wherein said second device sets the filename of a record to NULL after that particular record has been transmitted to the second device". Official Notice is taken of the fact that both the concept and advantages of providing a second device that sets the filename of a record to NULL after that particular record has been transmitted are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to have a second device that sets the filename of a record to NULL (or reset) after that particular record has been transmitted in order to indicate that the particular record has been fetched.

14. Claims 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taubman et al. (US Patent # 6,546,143) in view of Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224).

Art Unit: 2615

[Claim 36]

Taubman teaches a method for storing and transmitting image information for an image from a source device to a target device, the method comprising partitioning said image information at the source device into a plurality of layers, based on resolution and quality criteria (col. 1 lines 35-67, col. 2 lines 1-2)[The wavelet transform coefficients (frequency bands) can be transmitted in an “embedded bit-stream” is being read as organizing the bands (wavelet transform coefficients) into layers (embedded bit-stream). These “embedded bit-streams” (layers) are based upon a progressive transmission of quality or resolution as taught in Taubman reference (col. 1 lines 55-65)] and connected to the target device, transmitting attribute information for the image (It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that when the devices are connected they would transmit information which includes attribute information for an image). Taubman fails to teach storing directory information for the image at the source device allowing access to individual ones of said plurality of layers. However Davis teaches that these limitations are well known and used in the art (Col.6, lines 38-40). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taubman and Davis as a whole it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have directory information for the image at the source device allowing access to individual ones of said plurality of layers. The benefit of doing so would be to provide a method for deleting files on a UNIX file system, so that they may subsequently be undeleted, without any possibility of loss or damage (in the abstract).

[Claim 37]

Taubman teaches wherein said target device initially selects a single layer for transmission that permits at least crude rendering of the image (col. 2, lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 2615

[Claim 38]

Taubman teaches wherein said step of transmitting selected ones of said plurality of layers includes: successively fetching layers that allow rendering of the image at increasingly higher resolution. [Col. 1 lines 60-69 teach “Progressive-by-resolution” that involves rendering the image depending upon ordering the coefficients embedded in the bit-stream according to resolution of the image].

[Claim 39]

Taubman teaches wherein said step of transmitting selected ones of said plurality of layers includes: successively fetching layers that allow rendering of the image at increasingly higher quality (col. 1 lines 55-59).

Taubman teaches transmitting of layers between two devices but do not explicitly teach disconnecting the two devices; at a later point in time, re-establishing a connection between the two devices; transmitting an additional layer of said plurality of layers while the two devices are connected; and thereafter disconnecting the two devices. However it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that if the receiving computer can order an image of specific resolution for preview purposes as taught in Taubman (col. 1 lines 60-67, col. 2 lines 1-2) then the two devices can be disconnected and at a later point in time, re-establish a connection between the two devices to transmit an additional layer of said plurality of layers while the two devices are connected and thereafter disconnect the two devices again.

[Claim 40]

Taubman teaches transmitting of layers between two devices but do not explicitly teach occasionally connecting the two devices from time to time; and at each instance that the two

Art Unit: 2615

devices are connected, transmitting at least one of said plurality of layers from the source device to the target device, until all layers have been transmitted. However it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that if the receiving computer can order an image of specific resolution for preview purposes as taught in Taubman (col. 1 lines 60-67, col. 2 lines 1-2) then the two devices can be connected occasionally from time to time; and at each instance that the two devices are connected, transmitting at least one of said plurality of layers from the source device to the target device, until all layers have been transmitted.

[Claim 41]

Taubman teaches the two devices (server and client) can be connected via wireless communication medium; and while the two devices are connected via wireless communication medium (col. 11 lines 55-58)[Internet service can be provided via a wire-line or wirelessly], Taubman further teaches transmitting transmitting a first one of said plurality of layers from the source device to the target device (col. 2 lines 1-2).

[Claim 42]

Taubman teaches the two devices (server and client) can be connected via wire line communication medium; and while the two devices are connected via wire line communication medium (col. 11 lines 55-58)[Internet service can be provided via a wire-line or wirelessly]. The Examiner notes that the subsequent ones of said plurality of layers can be transmitted from the source device to the target device, until all layers have been transmitted when the receiving computer wants it.

[Claim 43]

Art Unit: 2615

The method of claim 36, wherein said first device includes an imaging device [The image on a computer can be taken with a digital camera or a scanner which are imaging devices].

[Claim 44]

The method of claim 36, wherein said second device includes a computer (Taubman, col. 2 lines 1-2).

[Claim 45]

Taubman discloses in figure 13, wherein said computer includes a selected one of a desktop computer and a server computer.

[Claim 46]

Taubman teaches wherein said computer includes Internet connectivity (col. 11 lines 55-58)

15. Claims 47, 49, 51, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (US Patent No. 6,067,383) in view of Ferriere et al (US Patent # 5,880,856) in further view of Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224).

[Claim 47]

A system providing a file format optimized for transmission of information between intermittently-connected devices, the system comprising:

a memory for storing image data; (Taniguchi figure 1 shows 7 as the code storage means).

Taniguchi fails to teach a logic for partitioning said image data into successive layers, wherein each successive layer storing information that permits rendering of the image at increasingly higher resolution and/or increasingly higher quality and logic for storing said successive layers in a file format and logic allowing a destination device to control uploading of successive layers to

Art Unit: 2615

the destination device. However Ferriere teaches that these limitations are well known and used in the art (col. 4 lines 64-67 col. 5 lines 1-2, col. 9 lines 19-27).

said file format comprising a plurality of records, each record storing information for a single layer (col. 9 lines 45-48). [Each row block is like a record] and logic allowing a destination device to control uploading of successive layers to the destination device (col. 1 lines 48-50). [Because the user can terminate the transfer at any point in time if the image turns out to be undesirable which means that the second device i.e. computer can control which layers are transmitted].

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi and Ferriere, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a logic for partitioning said image data into successive layers, wherein each successive layer storing information that permits rendering of the image at increasingly higher resolution and/or increasingly higher quality and logic for storing said successive layers in a file format said file format comprising: a plurality of records, each record storing information for a single layer. The benefit of doing so would be so that the images can be transferred over low-speed transmission links such as telephone lines more efficiently as taught in Ferriere (col. 4 lines 43-46). Taniguchi in view of Ferriere fails to teach a directory for accessing a record of a layer that is to be uploaded to a destination device. However these limitations are well known in the art and obvious as evidenced in Davis (col. 6 lines 32-40 fig. 6).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi, Ferriere and Davis as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have storing a record directory for accessing a record for a particular layer. Doing so would provide a method for deleting files on a UNIX file

Art Unit: 2615

system, so that they may subsequently be undeleted, without any possibility of loss or damage (Davis, in the abstract).

[Claim 49]

The system of claim 46, wherein each record exists as a physical record corresponding to a file within a file system (Ferriere col. 9 lines 42-44).

[Each row block is like a physical record.]

[Claim 51]

The system of claim 46, wherein said directory is modified after uploading of a layer, for indicating that that layer has been successfully uploaded. Official Notice is taken of the fact that both the concept and advantages of providing a modifying a directory to NULL are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to modify a directory to NULL (or reset) after that particular directory has been transmitted in order to indicate that the particular record has been fetched or uploaded by the second device.

[Claim 52]

The system of claim 47, wherein each of the layers is a two-dimensional enhancement of the complete image (Ferriere, col. 6 lines 20-28).

16. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (US Patent No. 6,067,383), Ferriere et al (US Patent # 5,880,856), Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224) in further view of Hoffman (US Patent # 5,761,655).

Re Claim 48, Taniguchi in view of Ferriere in further view of Davis fails to teach wherein said file format includes a header section storing attribute information for the image as claimed.

Art Unit: 2615

However these limitations are well known in the art and obvious as evidenced in (Hoffman, col.18 lines 44-46 fig. 35A).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi in view of Ferriere in further view of Davis and Hoffman as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate wherein said file format includes a header section storing attribute information for the image. Doing so would provide index node memory caching to minimize disk access as suggested by Hoffman (col. 18 lines 42-44).

17. Claims 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi (US Patent No. 6,067,383), Ferriere et al (US Patent # 5,880,856), Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224) in further view of Pratt (US PG-PUB 2001/0049693).

Re Claim 50, Taniguchi in view of Ferriere in further view of Davis fails to teach wherein each record exists as a logical record residing at a particular offset within a single binary object as claimed. However these limitations are well known in the art and obvious as evidenced in (Pratt, paragraph 33 and 46).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Taniguchi in view of Ferriere in further view of Davis and Pratt as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate each record existing as a logical record residing at a particular offset within a single binary object. Doing so would provide a structure and method for storing chip data in database tables as BLOB as suggested by Pratt (Paragraph 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

18. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2615

19. Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferriere (US Patent # 5,880,856).

[Claim 53]

A system providing an improved method of uploading image data, the system comprising:

A logic to partition the image data into a plurality of layers, wherein each of the plurality of layers includes information that permits rendering of the entire image, the plurality of layers being additive to render the image at increasingly better qualities (Ferriere, col. 4 lines 64-67, col. 5 lines 1-2);

a logic to allow a destination device to control uploading of successive layers to the destination device (Ferriere, col. 8 lines 41-54).

[Claim 54]

The system of claim 53, wherein the better qualities comprise one or more of the following: increasingly higher resolution, increasingly higher quality, increasingly larger sizes (Ferriere, col. 8 lines 38-40), and wherein each layer is a two-dimensional enhancement of the complete image (Ferriere, col. 5 lines 45-50).

[Claim 55]

The system of claim 53, further comprising:

A first subset of layers to provide increasingly better quality at a first resolution (Ferriere, col. 1 lines 43-46); and

A second subset of layers to provide increasingly better image quality at a second resolution, larger than the first resolution (Ferriere, col. 1 lines 46-48).

Art Unit: 2615

20. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferriere (US Patent # 5,880,856) in view of Davis (US Patent # 6,615,224).

[Claim 56]

Ferriere teaches logic for storing said successive layers in a file format, said file format comprising a plurality of records, each record storing information for a single layer (col. 9 lines 45-48 figure 13)[Each row block is read as a record]. Ferriere fails to teach, “a directory for accessing a record of a layer that is to be uploaded to a destination device; and wherein said directory is modified after uploading of a layer, for indicating that layer has been successfully uploaded”. However Davis teaches that these limitations are well known and used in the art (col. 6 lines 32-40 figure 6). [Having a filename for each record is read as directory being modified].

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ferriere and Davis as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have storing a record directory for accessing a record for a particular layer. Doing so would provide a method for deleting files on a UNIX file system, so that they may subsequently be undeleted, without any possibility of loss or damage (Davis, in the abstract).

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2615

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K Aggarwal whose telephone number is (703) 305-0346. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Primary Examiner, Ngoc Yen Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4946. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YKA
June 2, 2004


NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER